arXiv:1701.03380v1 [math.LO] 12 Jan 2017

On Dummett's Pragmatist Justification Procedure

Hermógenes Oliveira

Abstract

I show that propositional intuitionistic logic is complete with respect to a corrected version of Dummett's pragmatist justification procedure. In particular, given a pragmatist justification of an argument, I show how to obtain a natural deduction derivation of the conclusion of the argument from, at most, the same assumptions.

1 Introduction

In the Dummett-Prawitz tradition of proof-theoretic semantics, there has been many attempts to provide an inferentialist definition of logical validity. From a philosophical point of view, proof-theoretic definitions of validity explain the validity of arguments in terms of the *deductive use* of the logical constants, as expressed by inference rules. Here, Wittgenstein's ideas relating *meaning* and *use* have been a source of inspiration. In addition, Gentzen's investigations into deduction, particularly his calculus of natural deduction, are used as a starting point for explaining the meaning of the logical constants on the basis of rules governing their use.

In the standard natural deduction calculus [4, 8], the deductive use of a logical constant is governed by its introduction and elimination rules. From a semantic point of view, the introduction and elimination rules express the canonical manner in which a sentence with a logical constant as main operator is used in a deductive argument: the introduction rules express the canonical use of the sentence as a conclusion, the elimination rules the canonical use of the sentence as an assumption.

According to Dummett [1, 2], the analysis of the deductive meaning of a logical constant into introduction and elimination rules accounts for two

distinct aspects of its use. Roughly speaking, the introduction rules show how to establish a sentence, or to warrant its assertion; they stand for the "verificationist" aspect. On the other hand, the elimination rules show what consequences can be extracted from a sentence, or what difference accepting it makes to our practice; they stand for the "pragmatist" aspect.

Thus, in a verificationist approach to proof-theoretic semantics, valid arguments are defined on the basis of introductions rules. The main idea is that an argument is valid if, whenever we can obtain the assumptions in a canonical manner, we can also obtain the conclusion in a canonical manner. In a pragmatist approach, on the other hand, valid arguments are defined on the basis of elimination rules. Here, the main idea is that any consequence that can be drawn in a canonical manner from the conclusion can also be drawn in a canonical manner from the assumptions.

Prawitz [9, 14] and Dummett [1, 2] conjectured that proof-theoretic approaches to logical semantics would result in an intuitionistic, or constructive, notion of validity. With a bias towards the verificationist point of view, proof-theoretic definitions of validity have often been approached via introduction rules [9, 11, 12, 17, 14]. Unfortunately, with respect to their adequacy to intuitionistic logic, verificationist proposals have met with problems [15, 16, 7, 5, 6].

However, as suggested by some remarks of Gentzen [4], the introduction and elimination rules for a logical constant are harmoniously related, such that one could extract, in some sense, the elimination rules from the introduction rules and vice versa. The harmony between introduction and elimination rules suggests that the elimination rules could just as well provide a basis upon which to develop a proof-theoretic definition of validity.

The pragmatist proof-theoretic approach to validity, the one based on elimination rules, has received comparatively less attention [2, 13, 20]. In this text, I show that propositional intuitionistic logic is complete with respect to a corrected version of Dummett's pragmatist proof-theoretic definition of validity.

2 Terminology

I borrow most of the terminology from Dummett [2] himself. A noteworthy difference is the use of the term "assumption" in place of Dummett's term "initial premiss". I included Section 2.1 below in the interest of self-

containment, but it can be safely skipped by readers familiar with the notation and typographical conventions used in natural deduction. Section 2.2, on the other hand, introduces notions and terminology pertaining specifically to elimination rules and the pragmatist proof-theoretic approach.

2.1 Arguments and deductions

The logical constants are "$\rightarrow$" (implication), "$\vee$" (disjunction), "$\wedge$" (conjunction) and "$\bot$" (absurdity). As usual, "$\neg$" (negation) is defined in terms of the absurdity constant: $\neg A \equiv A \rightarrow \bot$. I use Latin letters ("$A$", "$B$", "$C$" etc.) to stand for arbitrary sentences and Greek letters ("Γ" and "Δ") to stand for lists of sentences. I write "Π" to denote trees of sentences. For the sake of simplicity, I often talk about sentences when I actually mean occurrences of sentences in a tree.

What I call *arguments* are formally represented by trees of sentences. They are naturally ordered from top to bottom, from the leaves to the root. They are constructed by *inference steps* that go from one or more sentences, the *premisses*, to a single sentence, the *consequence*. In an inference step, each premiss is either a leaf of the tree or the consequence of a previous inference step. Thus, argument trees are formal representations of the process of argumentation, or reasoning, with some leaves acting as *assumptions* and the root acting as the *conclusion* of the argument. Any occurrence of a sentence in an argument determine, in the obvious way, a subargument with that sentence as conclusion.[1] A *path* in an argument Π is a sequence of sentences $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ in Π such that each A_i, $i < n$, is a premiss of an inference step to consequence A_{i+1}. Every leaf in an argument is initially an assumption, but assumptions can be discharged by inference steps. After an assumption is discharged by an inference step, the argument, starting from the consequence of the inference step, does not depend anymore on that assumption. I indicate the discharge of assumptions using square brackets (as in "[A]"), but do not indicate which inference step discharged which assumption since it should be clear from the context. I write $\langle \Gamma, A \rangle$ to denote an argument from assumptions Γ (those that remained undischarged throughout the argument) to conclusion A without paying attention to the argumentation process that goes from Γ to A.

[1] As a limiting case, a single sentence occurrence is an argument with that sentence acting as both assumption and conclusion.

Formally, propositional intuitionistic logic is characterized by the standard system of natural deduction [4, 8]. The inference rules for the propositional connectives are symmetrically distributed between introduction (I) and elimination (E) rules.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}[A]\\ \vdots\\ B\end{array}}{A \to B}\ \to \mathrm{I} \qquad \frac{A \quad A \to B}{B}\ \to \mathrm{E}$$

$$\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B}\ \wedge \mathrm{I} \qquad \frac{A \wedge B}{A}\ \wedge \mathrm{E} \qquad \frac{A \wedge B}{B}\ \wedge \mathrm{E}$$

$$\frac{A}{A \vee B}\ \vee \mathrm{I} \qquad \frac{B}{A \vee B}\ \vee \mathrm{I} \qquad \frac{A \vee B \quad \begin{array}{c}[A]\\ \vdots\\ C\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}[B]\\ \vdots\\ C\end{array}}{C}\ \vee \mathrm{E}$$

The rule for the absurdity logical constant $\bot$ can be considered an elimination rule:

$$\frac{\bot}{A}\ \bot \mathrm{E}$$

Thus, natural deduction derivations are a special subclass of arguments in which every inference step is in accordance with one of the inference rules above.

2.2 Elimination rules and related notions

In an elimination rule for a logical constant, exactly one premiss of the rule is required to have that constant as main logical operator. This premiss is called the *major premiss*, and all others, if there are any others, are called *minor premisses*. An elimination rule is *vertical* when it allows the discharge of assumptions in the subarguments for its minor premisses and the same sentence occur as minor premiss (here also called *vertical premiss*) and consequence of the rule. Otherwise, the elimination rule is called *reductive*. In

every application of vertical elimination rules, the vertical premisses are required to discharge the assumptions as indicated by the rule.[2] In case a minor premiss is not vertical, it is *horizontal*.

The elimination rules express the deductive use of sentences as assumptions from which we extract consequences. Some elimination rules are applicable only in the presence of a specific context which is represented by minor premisses. When the notions above are applied to the case of propositional intuitionistic logic, one can see that the elimination rules for disjunction ($\vee$E) and implication ($\rightarrow$E) illustrate the occurrence of vertical and horizontal minor premisses, respectively. The elimination rules for conjunction ($\wedge$E) and the intuitionistic rule for absurdity (which can be seen as an elimination rule for "$\bot$") are reductive rules; but, in contrast with the elimination rule for implication, which is also reductive, they contain no minor premisses and can be applied independent of context.

3 Validity

The proof-theoretic justification procedures proposed by Dummett [2] consist of definitions of validity for arguments based on canonical inference rules for the logical constants. These inference rules fix the meaning of the logical constants by expressing their canonical deductive use. They are, in Dummett's terminology, "self-justifying".

In contrast with common practice [9, 10, 17, 20], Dummett's definitions are not based on semantic clauses for particular logical constants. Instead, he assumes that self-justifying rules are given. These self-justifying rules are introduction rules in the context of the verificationist procedure, and elimination rules in the context of the pragmatist procedure. In both procedures, the definitions are stated irrespective of the particular constants or rules provided. Dummett's approach is thus more general and can, in principle, be applied to any logic.

For our particular case, the self-justifying rules are the standard elimination rules of propositional intuitionistic logic: $\wedge$E, $\rightarrow$E, $\vee$E and $\bot$E.

From a pragmatist perspective, a canonical argument start from open (usually complex) assumptions and, by application of elimination rules, arrive at an atomic conclusion. Here, Dummett also admits *basic rules* (or

[2] Otherwise, the application of the elimination rule would be superfluous [8, p. 49–50]. This is in line with Dummett [2, p. 283].

boundary rules) in order to determine deducibility among atomic sentences. In canonical arguments, these basic rules can be applied to an atomic conclusion in order to obtain further atomic consequences.

However, since our main concern is with logical validity, I leave basic rules out of the picture and adapt Dummett's definitions accordingly, for the sake of simplicity.[3] I also adapt the definitions to the propositional case.

Definition 1. A sentence occurrence is *principal* if it is the major premiss of an elimination rule and the same holds for every sentence in the path down to the conclusion.

Definition 2. An argument is *proper* if at least one of its assumptions is principal.

The concept of proper argument is an essential component in the pragmatist notion of validity because proper arguments are built from the principal assumption by application of elimination rules. Arguments that do not follow this pattern are *improper*. The path from the principal assumption to the conclusion is the *principal path*.

But even in proper arguments, the presence of minor premisses in the elimination rules may introduce auxiliary assumptions which inevitably arrive at the conclusion through improper means, i. e., through a path that is not solely composed of major premisses of elimination.

Remark. Before we come to the definition of canonical argument, I would like to discuss a problem in Dummett's definitions which was pointed out by Prawitz [13, n. 15]: a counterexample to the general validity of *modus ponens*. In his answer to Prawitz, Dummett [3] acknowledges the problem. However, I find it interesting that Dummett [2, p. 285,286] himself had discussed an example which is almost an instance of Prawitz's counterexample:

$$\dfrac{A \to B \qquad \dfrac{(A \to B) \to ((C \to C) \to A) \quad A \to B}{A}}{B}$$

[3]Dummett [2, p. 273] explicitly stated the irrelevance of basic rules, or boundary rules, as he called them, to logical validity. Furthermore, by reflection on the pragmatist definition of validity (Definition 8, below), it is easy to see that any basic rule in the complementation can be transferred to the valid canonical argument required, thus making no difference to which non-atomic arguments are actually validated.

Here, Dummett assumes that the minor premiss A is atomic. This assumption is essential, because, according to Dummett's original definition, a canonical argument must have an atomic conclusion. Prawitz's counterexample is basically the same (Dummett's example being an instance thereof) with the difference that A is complex. As a result, there can be no canonical subargument for A and thus A cannot be validly obtained from more complex assumptions without violating Dummett's complexity restriction (Definition 6). However, there is no conceptually compelling reason why canonical arguments must have atomic conclusions. After all, we should be able to obtain also complex sentences in a canonical manner. I suspect that Dummett only imposed the requirement of atomic conclusion on canonical arguments in order to simplify the formulation of his definition of complementation. In order to avoid Prawitz's objections, I remove the requirement of atomic conclusion from Dummett's original definition of canonical argument and adapt the definition of complementation accordingly.

Definition 3. A sentence occurrence is *placid* if it is not a horizontal minor premiss nor any sentence down the path to the conclusion is a horizontal minor premiss.

Definition 4. A *canonical* argument has the following properties:

(i) it is proper;

(ii) the subargument for any placid vertical minor premiss of an elimination rule is proper.

Moreover, a *critical subargument* is a non-canonical argument whose conclusion is a horizontal minor premiss.

When it comes to auxiliary subarguments for minor premisses, the notion of canonicity deals with vertical and horizontal minor premisses differently. The subarguments for *vertical* minor premisses are considered independent auxiliary arguments and are thus required to be proper themselves. Ideally, the subarguments for *horizontal* minor premisses would also be proper (and canonical). However, *in general*, it is not possible to place any restrictions on the form of the subarguments for horizontal minor premisses: when not already canonical, those subarguments are critical, which means that the validity of the whole canonical argument would depend on their validity (see Definition 8).

Example 1. In order to illustrate the notion of a canonical argument, consider an argument of the form

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{A \to (D \wedge (B \vee C)) \quad A}{D \wedge (B \vee C)}}{B \vee C} \qquad \begin{matrix}[B] \\ \vdots \\ E\end{matrix} \qquad \begin{matrix}[C] \\ \vdots \\ E\end{matrix}}{E} \tag{1}$$

The argument (1) is proper (clause (i)) and has $A \to (D \wedge (B \vee C))$ as principal assumption. It would be canonical provided that the subarguments from B to E and from C to E are proper (clause (ii)). Now, suppose we add an application of $\to$E to the end:

$$\dfrac{E \to F \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{A \to (D \wedge (B \vee C)) \quad A}{D \wedge (B \vee C)}}{B \vee C} \qquad \begin{matrix}[B] \\ \vdots \\ E\end{matrix} \qquad \begin{matrix}[C] \\ \vdots \\ E\end{matrix}}{E}}{F} \tag{2}$$

The argument (2) is still canonical (now with $E \to F$ as principal assumption). The subarguments for the vertical minor premisses are not required to be proper anymore, since the vertical premisses are no longer placid (Definition 3). In case they are indeed improper, the subargument for the horizontal minor premiss E would not be canonical and would be, therefore, critical. However, a permutation step (pushing the application of $\to$E up) is sufficient to obtain a canonical argument (3) with placid vertical premisses:

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{A \to (D \wedge (B \vee C)) \quad A}{D \wedge (B \vee C)}}{B \vee C} \qquad \dfrac{E \to F \quad \begin{matrix}[B] \\ \vdots \\ E\end{matrix}}{F} \qquad \dfrac{E \to F \quad \begin{matrix}[C] \\ \vdots \\ E\end{matrix}}{F}}{F} \tag{3}$$

Remark. Notice that canonical arguments are composed primarily of elimination rules: a principal path (which is composed of eliminations) and subarguments for minor premisses which are themselves either proper (with a principal path composed of eliminations) or critical. Thus, a canonical argu-

ment has the general form



where the rules applied are guaranteed to be eliminations except for the critical subarguments (represented with "$\bigtriangledown$" above) since the definitions impose no restrictions on the form of their inference steps. So, if we exclude the critical subarguments, what remains is the proper part of the canonical argument. In the proper part, in addition to the principal assumption, all other assumptions are principal assumptions of proper subarguments. In the context of canonical arguments, I call them, collectively, *proper assumptions*.

Definition 5. The *degree of a sentence* A is the number of logical constants that appear in A. The *degree of an argument* $\langle \Gamma, A \rangle$ is the maximum among the degrees of the assumptions Γ and the conclusion A.

Definition 6. A canonical argument is *narrowly valid* if all its critical subarguments are valid and of lower degree than the argument as a whole. Furthermore, a canonical argument is *valid* or *broadly valid* if there are effective means of transforming it into a narrowly valid canonical argument with the same assumptions and conclusion.

Definition 7. A *complementation* of an argument with conclusion A is obtained as follows:

(i) if A is atomic, the argument is its own complementation;

(ii) if A is complex, we replace it by a narrowly valid canonical argument with atomic conclusion, A as principal assumption and degree not greater than the degree of the original argument.

Definition 8. An argument is *valid* if there is an effective method to transform any complementation of it into a narrowly valid canonical argument with, at most, the same assumptions and the same conclusion.

Definitions 6, 7 and 8 should always be considered together since they define notions in terms of each other. For instance, the notion of narrowly valid canonical argument in Definition 6 is defined in terms of the notion

of valid argument which is itself only defined in Definition 8. Circularity is avoided because to ascertain the narrow validity of canonical arguments (as in Definition 6), it is sufficient to consider only the validity (as in Definition 8) of critical subarguments of lower degree.

The process of complementation consists basically in the application of elimination rules to the conclusion of the argument until we reach an atomic sentence. During complementation, the application of elimination rules with minor premisses can introduce auxiliary assumptions. Thus, the valid canonical argument required by Definition 8 can depend on additional assumptions introduced by complementation.

Theorem 1. *If an argument $\langle \Gamma, G \rangle$ is valid, then there is a natural deduction derivation of G from Γ in intuitionistic logic.*

Proof. Suppose $\langle \Gamma, G \rangle$ is valid. By Definition 8, for any complementation Π_c, we have a valid canonical argument Π_v with, at most, the same assumptions and the same conclusion. By Definition 7, the complementations are obtained by replacing G with a valid canonical argument which has G as principal assumption. By Definition 2, there is a principal path in Π_c from G to the atomic conclusion C which consists solely of applications of elimination rules. Furthermore, there can be auxiliary assumptions Δ in the subarguments for minor premisses of elimination rules in the principal path.

$$\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ \hline G, \Delta \\ \vdots \\ C \end{array} \qquad (\Pi_c)$$

By Definition 8, the valid canonical argument Π_v have C as conclusion and, at most, Γ, Δ as assumptions. We use Π_v as base and assume that we already have a natural deduction derivation Π_d for C from Γ, Δ obtained by recursive application of the procedure described here to the critical subarguments of Π_v.[4] Then, we go through the applications of elimination rules in the principal path and construct, through a process of inversion, a natural

[4]Recall that a canonical argument is already a natural deduction derivation except for the critical subarguments (see remark on page 8). The recursive application of the procedure to the critical subarguments of Π_v will always terminate since, by Definition 8, Π_v is narrowly valid and thus, by Definition 6, have only critical subarguments of lower degree.

deduction derivation of G from Γ alone. Starting with C, we obtain a natural deduction derivation for each principal sentence in the principal path until we reach G (at which point we would have either dispensed with or discharged the auxiliary assumptions Δ). Since Definition 8 provides a valid canonical argument Π_v for *any* complementation Π_c, we are free to choose the complementations more convenient for the construction of our natural deduction derivation. We proceed case by case, where each case shows the derivation of the major premiss on the basis of derivations of the principal sentences that came before (ordered from C to G). For the cases of $\vee$E and $\rightarrow$E, which introduce auxiliary assumptions, I show how these assumptions can be dispensed with ($\vee$E) or discharged ($\rightarrow$E). That is, for each occurrence of $\vee$E and $\rightarrow$E in the principal path of Π_c, I show how to obtain a derivation from only Γ, Δ_*, where Δ_* stands for the auxiliary assumptions except those assumptions that are being introduced at that particular inference step. As a result, after going through all sentences in the principal path, we obtain a derivation of G which depends solely on Γ.

($\bot$E) Take the complementation where C is an atomic sentence which does not occur as a subsentence in either Γ or Δ. As a result, $\bot$E is the last rule applied. I show that Π_d contain a derivation of the principal sentence $\bot$ of Π_c which depends, at most, on Γ, Δ.

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\Gamma}{G,\,\Delta}\;\vdots}{\dfrac{\bot}{C}} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \dfrac{\boxed{\begin{array}{c}\Gamma,\,\Delta\\ \vdots\\ \bot\end{array}}}{C}$$

By Definition 2, Π_d has a principal path from one of the assumptions Γ, Δ to C. Since C is not a subsentence of the principal assumption, it could only have been obtained by either $\bot$E or $\vee$E. In the first case, we already have a derivation of $\bot$ from Γ, Δ. In the second case, by Definition 4, the subarguments for the vertical premisses of $\vee$E are proper and hence have a principal path from, at most, Γ, Δ to C. Again, since C is not a subsentence of any proper assumption, we can iterate the process until we finally obtain a derivation of $\bot$ from, at most, Γ, Δ.

($\vee$E) Take the complementation of the form below, where $A \rightarrow C$ and $B \rightarrow C$ are assumed and C is atomic and does not occur as a subsentence in

either Γ, A, B or auxiliary assumptions Δ_* (where Δ_* does not contain $A \to C$ and $B \to C$).

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\Gamma}{G,\,\Delta_*}\\ \vdots\\ A \vee B \qquad \dfrac{A \to C \quad [A]}{C} \qquad \dfrac{B \to C \quad [B]}{C}}{C}$$

In the derivation Π_d, the conclusion C could have been obtained:

(a) by $\bot$E, in which case it is easy to derive $A \vee B$ instead by the same rule;

(b) by $\vee$E, in which case, by Definition 4, we have proper subderivations for the vertical premisses, leading us back to either (a), a reiteration of (b), or finally

(c) by $\to$E from either $A \to C$ or $B \to C$ as principal assumption.

$$\dfrac{A \to C \qquad \boxed{\begin{array}{c}\Gamma, \Delta_*\\ \vdots\\ A\end{array}}}{C} \qquad \dfrac{B \to C \qquad \boxed{\begin{array}{c}\Gamma, \Delta_*\\ \vdots\\ B\end{array}}}{C} \qquad \rightsquigarrow \qquad \dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\Gamma, \Delta_*\\ \vdots\\ A\end{array}}{A \vee B} \qquad \dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\Gamma, \Delta_*\\ \vdots\\ B\end{array}}{A \vee B}$$

In either case, we obtain a derivation of $A \vee B$ from the subderivation of the horizontal minor premiss by $\vee$I.

Because of our choice of C, in case our derivation of $A \vee B$ depends on assumptions $A \to C$ or $B \to C$, we can dispense with those assumptions by putting the derivation into normal form [8, Chap. IV, § 2].[5]

($\wedge$E) Take the complementations by both $\wedge$E rules

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\Gamma}{G,\,\Delta}\\ \vdots\\ A \wedge B}{A} \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{\Gamma}{G,\,\Delta}\\ \vdots\\ A \wedge B}{B} \qquad \rightsquigarrow \qquad \dfrac{\begin{array}{cc}\Gamma, \Delta & \Gamma, \Delta\\ \vdots & \vdots\\ A & B\end{array}}{A \wedge B}$$

[5] In Prawitz's terminology: Since C is atomic, a normal derivation Π with $A \to C$ or $B \to C$ as assumptions would have C as a minimum segment in some path in Π, which is impossible in this case given our choice of C.

From the derivations of A and B, it is easy to obtain one of $A \wedge B$ by $\wedge$I.

($\rightarrow$E) Take the complementation in which the minor premiss A is assumed.

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\Gamma}{G,\,\Delta_*}\;\vdots}{\dfrac{A \rightarrow B \quad A}{B}} \qquad \rightsquigarrow \qquad \dfrac{\Gamma, \Delta_*, [A]\;\vdots}{\dfrac{B}{A \rightarrow B}}$$

From a derivation of B from Γ, Δ, we apply $\rightarrow$I to obtain $A \rightarrow B$, discharging A. □

Corollary 1. *Propositional intuitionistic logic is complete with respect to pragmatist proof-theoretic validity.*

4 Concluding Remarks

Dummett's pragmatist justification procedure rejects a widely accepted dogma of proof-theoretic semantics: *the primacy of the categorical over the hypothetical* or, as it is also called, *the placeholder view of assumptions* [18, 19]. According to this view, assumptions are placeholders for closed proofs and thus hypothetical reasoning (reasoning from assumptions) are explained in terms of categorical reasoning (proofs without assumptions). In contrast, the pragmatist proof-theoretic notion of canonical argument considers arguments from assumptions as primary and not to be explained away in terms of closed arguments (proofs).

Furthermore, the prevalence of the placeholder view of assumptions has imparted greater emphasis to assertions in detriment of other speech acts like denial or supposition. Here also, the pragmatist approach suggests ways to widen the conceptual arena and provide interesting alternative points of view.

Acknowledgements. I received very helpful comments and suggestions from the research group on Logic and Language in Tübingen. I am indebted in particular to Peter Schroeder-Heister who suggested to me the idea of pragmatist canonical arguments with complex conclusions and to

Luca Tranchini who read and made comments on an early draft. This work was supported by the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD), grant number 91562976.

References

[1] Dummett, Michael, 'The philosophical basis of intuitionistic logic', in H.E. Rose, and J.C. Shepherdson, (eds.), *Logic Colloquium '73 Proceedings of the Logic Colloquium*, vol. 80 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1975, pp. 5–40.

[2] Dummett, Michael, *The Logical Basis Of Metaphysics*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1991.

[3] Dummett, Michael, 'Reply to Dag Prawitz', in Randall E. Auxier, and Lewis Edwin Hahn, (eds.), *The Philosophy of Michael Dummett*, vol. XXXI of *The Library of Living Philosophers*, chap. 13, Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago and La Salle, Illinois, 2007, pp. 482–489.

[4] Gentzen, Gerhard, 'Untersuchungen über das logische schließen I', *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 39 (1935), 1, 176–210.

[5] Goldfarb, Warren, 'On Dummett's proof-theoretic justification of logical laws', in Thomas Piecha, and Peter Schroeder-Heister, (eds.), *Advances in Proof-Theoretic Semantics*, vol. 43 of *Trends in Logic*, Springer, 2016, pp. 195–210.

[6] Piecha, Thomas, 'Completeness in proof-theoretic semantics', in Thomas Piecha, and Peter Schroeder-Heister, (eds.), *Advances in Proof-Theoretic Semantics*, vol. 43 of *Trends in Logic*, Springer, 2016, pp. 231–251.

[7] Piecha, Thomas, Wagner de Campos Sanz, and Peter Schroeder-Heister, 'Failure of completeness in proof-theoretic semantics', *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 44 (2015), 3, 321–335.

[8] Prawitz, Dag, *Natural Deduction: A Proof-Theoretical Study*, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm, 1965.

[9] Prawitz, Dag, 'Ideas and results in proof theory', *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, 66 (1971), 235–307.

[10] Prawitz, Dag, 'Towards a foundation of a general proof theory', in Patrick Suppes, Leon Henkin, Athanase Joja, and G. C. Moisil, (eds.), *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science IV*, vol. 74 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1973, pp. 225–250.

[11] Prawitz, Dag, 'Truth and objectivity from a verificationist point of view', in H. G. Dales, and G. Oliveri, (eds.), *Truth in Mathematics*, Claredon Press, Oxford, 1998, pp. 41–51.

[12] Prawitz, Dag, 'Meaning approached via proofs', *Synthese*, 148 (2006), 3, 507–524.

[13] Prawitz, Dag, 'Pragmatist and verificationist theories of meaning', in Randall E. Auxier, and Lewis Edwin Hahn, (eds.), *The Philosophy of Michael Dummett*, vol. XXXI of *The Library of Living Philosophers*, chap. 13, Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago and La Salle, Illinois, 2007, pp. 455–481.

[14] Prawitz, Dag, 'An approach to general proof theory and a conjecture of a kind of completeness of intuitionistic logic revisited', in Luiz Carlos Pereira, Edward Hermann Haeusler, and Valéria de Paiva, (eds.), *Advances in Natural Deduction*, vol. 39 of *Trends in Logic*, Springer, Dordrecht, 2014, pp. 269–279.

[15] Sandqvist, Tor, 'Classical logic without bivalence', *Analisys*, 69 (2009), 2, 211–218.

[16] Sanz, Wagner de Campos, Thomas Piecha, and Peter Schroeder-Heister, 'Constructive semantics, admissibility of rules and the validity of Peirce's law', *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, 22 (2014), 2, 297–308.

[17] Schroeder-Heister, Peter, 'Validity concepts in proof-theoretic semantics', *Synthese*, 148 (2006), 3, 525–571.

[18] Schroeder-Heister, Peter, 'Proof-theoretic versus model-theoretic consequence', in Michal Peliš, (ed.), *The Logica Yearbook 2007*, Filosofia, Prague, 2008, pp. 187–200.

[19] Schroeder-Heister, Peter, 'The categorical and the hypothetical: A critique of some fundamental assumptions of standard semantics', *Synthese*, 187 (2012), 3, 925–942.

[20] Schroeder-Heister, Peter, 'Proof-theoretic validity based on elimination rules', in Edward Hermann Hauesler, Wagner de Campos Sanz, and Bruno Lopes, (eds.), *Why is this a Proof? (Festschrift for Luiz Carlos Pereira)*, vol. 27 of *Tributes*, College Publications, London, UK, 2015, pp. 159–176.